

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated May 13, 2010, Applicant has amended the claims, which when considered with the following remarks, is deemed to place the present application in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested. The amendments to the claims have been made in the interest of expediting prosecution of this case. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the same or similar subject matter in this or another application.

Claim 16 is pending in this application. By this Amendment, Claim 16 has been canceled and new Claims 64-83 have been added. Support for new Claims 64-83 can be found throughout the specification, for example, starting on page 13, line 10 through page 22, line 11. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added to the subject application by this amendment. Moreover, it is submitted that the claims as now presented place the subject application in condition for immediate allowance.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Heneghan et al., JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING FOR GAS TURBINES AND POWER TRANSACTIONS OF THE ASME (“Heneghan et al.”). Of the claims, Claim 16 has been canceled and new Claims 64-83 have been added. Applicant respectfully submits that Heneghan et al. do not disclose each and every element of new Claims 64-83.

Heneghan et al. fail to disclose or suggest a “high throughput method for screening fuel additive composition samples, under program control, comprising: (a) conducting molecular modeling of at least one fuel additive to formulate a leading candidate fuel additive composition sample for testing; (b) containing a plurality of the leading candidate fuel additive composition

samples in a plurality of test receptacles, each sample comprising at least one fuel additive; (c) measuring the deposit formation of each sample to provide deposit formation data results for each sample; and, (d) outputting the results of step (c)", as presently recited in new Claim 64.

Rather, Heneghan et al. merely disclose the study of jet fuel thermal stability (carbon deposition rate), dissolved oxygen consumption and methane production for three baseline jet fuels and three fuels blended with additives using a flowing, single-pass heat exchanger test rig. Heneghan et al. further disclose in item 4 on page 481 that in order to measure the carbon deposition of the sample, the test section of the rig is removed, drained, cut into 25 mm or 50 mm length segments, rinsed with hexane, dried in a vacuum oven and analyzed for carbon deposits on a Leco RC-412 multiphase carbon analyzer. Heneghan et al. however are completely silent as to the presently recited step of conducting molecular modeling of at least one fuel additive to formulate a leading candidate fuel additive composition sample for testing in the claimed method. Thus, Heneghan et al. cannot disclose each and every element of the claimed high throughput method for screening fuel additive composition samples, under program control, employing the specifically recited steps (a)-(d).

Accordingly, Claims 64-83 are believed to be novel over Heneghan et al. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Appln. No. 10/779,419
Amdt. dated August 3, 2010
Response to Office Action dated May 13, 2010

For the foregoing reasons, Claims 64-83 as presented herein is believed to be in condition for allowance. Such early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael E. Carmen
Reg. No. 43,533
Attorney for Applicants

M. CARMEN & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
1201 RXR Plaza
Uniondale, New York 11556
(516) 992-1848 (phone)
(516) 739-0981 (fax)
MEC/bg